

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

COURTNEY MOTLEY,

Plaintiff,

v.

STATE OF NEVADA, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:21-cv-00034-MMD-WGC

ORDER

I. DISCUSSION

This action began with a *pro se* civil rights complaint filed under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 by Plaintiff Courtney Motley, a former state prisoner. On September 16, 2021, this Court issued an order directing Motley to file a non-prisoner application to proceed *in forma pauperis* with this Court within 30 days. (ECF No. 5.) The 30-day period has now expired, and Motley has not filed a non-prisoner application to proceed *in forma pauperis* or otherwise responded to the Court's order.

District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and “[i]n the exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal” of a case. *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action, with prejudice, based on a party's failure to prosecute an action, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules. See *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53-54 (9th Cir. 1995) (affirming dismissal for noncompliance with local rule); *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (affirming dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring amendment of complaint); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (affirming dismissal for failure to comply with local rule requiring *pro se* plaintiffs to keep court apprised of address); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Serv.*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (affirming dismissal for failure to

1 comply with court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986)
2 (affirming dismissal for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with local rules).

3 In determining whether to dismiss an action for lack of prosecution, failure to obey
4 a court order, or failure to comply with local rules, the court must consider several factors:
5 (1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to
6 manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring
7 disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives.
8 See *Thompson*, 782 F.2d at 831; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1423-24; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at
9 130; *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1260-61; *Ghazali*, 46 F.3d at 53.

10 Here, the Court finds that the first two factors, the public's interest in expeditiously
11 resolving this litigation and the Court's interest in managing the docket, weigh in favor of
12 dismissal. The third factor, risk of prejudice to Defendants, also weighs in favor of
13 dismissal, since a presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay
14 in filing a pleading ordered by the court or prosecuting an action. See *Anderson v. Air*
15 *West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976). The fourth factor—public policy favoring
16 disposition of cases on their merits—is greatly outweighed by the factors in favor of
17 dismissal discussed herein. Finally, a court's warning to a party that his failure to obey
18 the court's order will result in dismissal satisfies the "consideration of alternatives"
19 requirement. *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1262; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 132-33; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d
20 at 1424.

21 The Court's order requiring Motley to file a non-prisoner application to proceed *in*
22 *forma pauperis* with the Court within 30 days expressly stated: "IT IS FURTHER
23 ORDERED that, if Plaintiff fails to timely comply with this order, this case will be subject
24 to dismissal without prejudice." (ECF No. 5 at 2.) Thus, Motley had adequate warning that
25 dismissal would result from noncompliance with the Court's order to file a non-prisoner
26 application to proceed *in forma pauperis* within 30 days.

27 ///

28 ///

It is therefore ordered that this action is dismissed without prejudice based on Motley's failure to file a non-prisoner application to proceed *in forma pauperis* in compliance with this Court's September 16, 2021, order.

DATED THIS 28th Day of October 2021.

MIRANDA M. DU
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE